



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/692,669	10/24/2003	Naveen Bali	5693P032	9970
48102 7590 04/30/2008 NETWORK APPLIANCE/BLAKELY 1279 OAKMEAD PARKWAY SUNNYVALE, CA 94085-4040				
EXAMINER NGUYEN, DUSTIN				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2154				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
04/30/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/692,669

Applicant(s)

BALI ET AL.

Examiner

DUSTIN NGUYEN

Art Unit

2154

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 January 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6, 8-17 and 22-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6, 8-17 and 22-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/S508)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-6, 8-17 and 22-26 are presented for examination.

Claim Objections

2. Claims 6, 8-10 are objected to because of the following informalities:

As per claim 6, "an FC" should be corrected as "a FC"

As per claim 6, "the another port" should be corrected as "the another FC port"

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 6, 22, and 24-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zhu et al. [US Patent No 6,353,612], in view of Latif et al. [US Patent Application No 2003/0091037].

5. As per claim 22, Zhu discloses the invention as claimed including a method for creating a link from a first Fibre Channel (FC) node device to a second FC node device on an FC fabric having a name server for the FC fabric [i.e. end-device to communicate with other] [Figure 1; and col 1, lines 34-45], the method comprising:

querying the name server to retrieve a plurality of values for a symbolic name field within a name server database for the name server [i.e. the name server stores registration information such as service parameters and a symbolic name for the port and allow query the fabric's simple name server for Fibre channel attributes of other registered ports] [col 1, lines 35-45; col 2, lines 34-39; col 8, lines 56-65; and col 10, lines 3-9];

searching the plurality of values received from the name server for a combination of a plurality of attributes of the second FC node device [i.e. retrieve registration information of any other registered ports] [col 9, lines 60-col 10, lines 9]; and

the second FC node device has the combination as a value for a corresponding symbolic name field [i.e. to communicate from source port to destination port, the source port queries the SNS for the attributes of other ports] [col 1, lines 34-56; and col 5, lines 24-34].

Zhu does not specifically disclose

creating the link from the first FC node device using an FC identifier for the second FC node device, wherein the FC identifier is obtained from the name server.

Latif discloses

creating the link from the first FC node device using an FC identifier for the second FC node device, wherein the FC identifier is obtained from the name server [i.e. the initiator logs

into the target node to establish link parameters for the exchange of information] [Figure 7; and paragraphs 0063 and 0073].

It would have been obvious to a person skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Zhu and Latif because the teaching of Latif on creating link would enable for receiving, translating, and routing data packets between SCSI, Fibre channel and Ethernet devices in a flexible, programmable manner [Latif, paragraph 0002].

6. As per claim 24, Zhu discloses wherein the combination of the plurality of attributes are registered with the name server as a symbolic name by the second FC node device [i.e. end device registration such as symbolic name] [col 2, lines 33-38].

7. As per claim 25, Zhu discloses wherein the plurality of attributes are automatically detected and combined for the combination by an operating system for the second FC node device [col 6, lines 24-33].

8. As per claim 26, Zhu discloses wherein the combination is stored at a predefined location within a symbolic name field for each port, as defined in the FC protocol, in the name server database [i.e. store registration information] [col 6, lines 1-12].

9. As per claim 6, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claims 22 and 24.

10. Claims 11, 12, 14-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zhu et al. [US Patent No 6,353,612], in view of Latif et al. [US Patent Application No 2003/0091037], and further in view of Foster et al. [7,042,877].

11. As per claim 11, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claim 22. Furthermore, Zhu and Latif do not specifically disclose create a link based on a match of a symbolic name of the first FC port and a symbolic name of the second FC port. Foster discloses create a link based on a match of a symbolic name of the first FC port and a symbolic name of the second FC port [i.e. determine an appropriate destination to which corresponding data frame will be forwarded] [Abstract; col 3, lines 49-54; col 10, lines 17-24; and col 12, lines 58-col13, lines 16]. It would have been obvious to a person skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Zhu, Latif and Foster because the teaching of Foster would allow a security model to be used to provide various types and levels of security [Foster, col 20, lines 4-40].

12. As per claim 12, Zhu discloses wherein the symbolic name stored within the name server is automatically derived based on the attributes of the first and second FC ports [col 5, lines 40-42; and col 8, lines 5-12].

13. As per claim 14, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claim 11. Furthermore, Latif discloses an upper-level protocol (ULP) supported by the first FC port [paragraph 0034].

14. As per claim 15, Foster discloses wherein the upper-level protocol is the Fibre Channel Virtual Interface (FCVI) protocol [col 5, lines 32-50].

15. As per claim 16, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claim 14.

16. As per claim 17, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claim 12.

17. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zhu et al. [US Patent No 6,353,612], in view of Latif et al. [US Patent Application No 2003/0091037], and further in view of Foster et al. [7,042,877], and Betker et al. [US Patent No 7,230,929].

18. As per claim 13, Zhu discloses the attribute comprises a port-type [col 5, lines 28-34]. Zhu, Latif and Foster do not specifically disclose the attributes comprises a slot number, and a sub-slot number for the first and second FC ports. Betker discloses the attributes comprises a slot number, and a sub-slot number for the first and second FC ports [col 4, lines 51-54; and col 5, lines 35-45]. It would have been obvious to a person skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Zhu, Latif, Foster and Betker because the teaching of Betker would allow to interconnect fibre channel devices in an efficient and consistent manner.

19. Claims 23, and 8-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zhu et al. [US Patent No 6,353,612], in view of Latif et al. [US Patent Application No 2003/0091037], and further in view of Betker et al. [US Patent No 7,230,929].

20. As per claim 23, Zhu discloses the plurality of attributes are selected from the group consisting of a port type [col 5, lines 28-34]. Zhu and Latif do not specifically disclose wherein the plurality of attributes are selected from the group consisting a slot number and a sub-slot number for each port in the second FC node device. Butler discloses wherein the plurality of attributes are selected from the group consisting a slot number and a sub-slot number for each port in the second FC node device [col 4, lines 51-54; and col 5, lines 35-45]. It would have been obvious to a person skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Zhu, Latif and Betker because the teaching of Betker would allow to interconnect fibre channel devices in an efficient and consistent manner.

21. As per claim 8, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claim 23.

22. As per claim 9, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claim 25.

23. As per claim 10, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claim 26.

24. Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zhu et al.

[US Patent No 6,353,612], in view of Latif et al. [US Patent Application No 2003/0091037], and further in view of Tawil et al. [US Patent No 6,625,747].

25. As per claim 1, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claim 22. Furthermore, Zhu and Latif do not specifically disclose assigning a common name to a pair of ports, wherein each port in the pair of port is located on first and second FC node devices, respectively, and the pair of ports includes a source port and a destination port; storing the common name-to-port assignment within a name server for the FC fabric. Tawil discloses assigning a common name to a pair of ports, wherein each port in the pair of port is located on first and second FC node devices, respectively [Abstract; and col 2, lines 34-46], and the pair of ports includes a source port and a destination port [Figure 2; and col 6, lines 26-62]; storing the common name-to-port assignment within a name server for the FC fabric [col 2, lines 31-34]. It would have been obvious to a person skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Zhu, Latif and Tawil because the teaching of Tawil would enable to associate or pair controllers associated with common storage by assigning both controllers the same world wide node name [Tawil, col 3, lines 11-19].

26. As per claim 2, Tawil discloses wherein assigning the common name comprises automatically deriving the common name based on attributes of the pair of ports [col 4, lines 64-col 5, lines 7].

27. Claims 3-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zhu et al. [US Patent No 6,353,612], in view of Latif et al. [US Patent Application No 2003/0091037], and further in view of Tawil et al. [US Patent No 6,625,747], and Betker et al. [US Patent No 7,230,929].

28. As per claim 3, Zhu discloses wherein automatically deriving the common name comprises detecting a port type [col 5, lines 28-34]. Zhu, Latif, Tawil do not specifically disclose a slot number, and a sub-slot number for the pair of ports; and combining the port type, the slot number and the sub-slot number for the common name. Betker discloses a slot number, and a sub-slot number for the pair of ports; and combining the port type, the slot number and the sub-slot number for the common name [col 4, lines 51-54; and col 5, lines 35-45]. It would have been obvious to a person skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Zhu, Latif, Tawil and Betker because the teaching of Betker would allow to interconnect fibre channel devices in an efficient and consistent manner.

29. As per claim 4, Zhu discloses storing the common name within at least a portion of a symbolic name for each port, as defined in the FC protocol [col 1, lines 35-45; col 2, lines 34-39; col 8, lines 56-65; and col 10, lines 3-9].

30. As per claim 5, Zhu discloses configuring each port to register the common name as a symbolic name with the name server [i.e. end device registration such as symbolic name] [col 2, lines 33-38].

31. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-6, 8-17 and 22-26 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

32. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dustin Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-3971. The examiner can normally be reached on flex.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nathan Flynn can be reached at (571) 272-1915. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Dustin Nguyen/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2154